

1 **REMARKS**

2 Claims 1-21 and 26 were previously cancelled, claims 22-25 and 27-30 are  
3 currently amended. Claims 22-25 and 27-31 remain in the application for  
4 consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant traverses the Office's  
5 rejections and respectfully requests that the application be forwarded on to  
6 issuance.

7  
8 **Examiner Communication**

9 Applicant would like to thank Examiner Donaghue for his time in discussing  
10 this Application over the phone. During the interview, Applicant and Examiner  
11 discussed the notion that the prior art does not teach a proxy network address  
12 translation device—and, particularly one having the architecture recited in the  
13 claims. Applicant has amended the independent claims in a manner that is consistent  
14 with the discussions held with the Examiner. The Examiner indicated that these  
15 amendments would receive favorable treatment.

16  
17 **§ 103 Rejections**

18 Claims 22-25 and 27-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
19 obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,212,558 to Antur, et al. (hereinafter "Antur") in  
20 view of Proxy Server's Structural Design by Rozell, et al. (hereinafter "Rozell")  
21 and further in view of Xie et al (hereinafter "Xie").  
22  
23  
24  
25

## The Claims

**Claim 22** is amended, and as amended recites a system for securing data communication between an internet computer network and an external computer network, comprising [added language is indicated in bold italics]:

- a client located in the internal computer network;
- a server located in the external computer network and in communication with the client; and
- a ***proxy network address translation*** device comprising:
  - components for (1) performing, at a packet level, a network address translation upon a stream of packets originating from the client and (2) filtering, at a stream level, the stream of packets and transmitting the packets to the server, wherein the filtering is transparent to the client, and wherein the network address translation component redirects the stream of packets to the filtering component; and
- a communications socket internal to the ***proxy network address translation*** device and communicatively connected to the components for (1) performing the network address translation and (2) filtering.

As per Applicant's discussion with the Office, Applicant has amended this claim to traverse the § 103 rejection over Antur in view of Rozell and further in view of Xie.

Applicant has amended this claim to recite a ***proxy network address translation device*** (PNAT). As discussed during the interview with the Examiner, the cited references neither disclose nor suggest any such feature having an internal communication socket as recited in this claim.

The notion of a PNAT, at least some aspects of which are within the spirit of this claim, is described in Applicant's Specification. Generally, a PNAT, as disclosed in Applicant's specification, includes both (1) a Network Address

1 Translation (NAT) component and (2) a proxy component. (see Applicant's  
2 Specification, page 3, lines 5-11). Thus, a PNAT combines "the advantages of  
3 proxy servers with the advantages of NAT." (Applicant's Specification, page 3,  
4 lines 13-14). This combination is advantageous because "like a NAT, the  
5 combined PNAT does not require special installed components on the clients for  
6 access through the PNAT. However, like a proxy server, the combined PNAT  
7 enables data inspection at a stream level, which means that better security and  
8 more rich features can still be provided by the PNAT." (Applicant's specification,  
9 page 3, lines 14-17).

10 Antur does not teach or in any way suggest a PNAT having the architecture  
11 recited in this claim. Specifically, neither Antur nor the other references teach a  
12 PNAT having a *communications socket internal* to the *proxy network address*  
13 *translation* device. This socket, as depicted in figure 5 as component 518, allows  
14 internal communication between the NAT component and the filtering component  
15 of a PNAT. None of the references of record teach or in any way suggest a  
16 communications socket internal to the proxy network address translation (PNAT)  
17 device.

18 Accordingly, for all of the reasons discussed above, and in light of the  
19 current amendments, this claim is allowable.

20 **Claim 23** depends from claim 22 and thus is allowable as depending from  
21 an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features  
22 which, in combination with those recited in claim 22, are neither disclosed nor  
23 suggested by the reference of record.

24 **Claim 24** is amended, and as amended recites a device comprising [added  
25 language is indicated in bold italics]:

1 *a proxy network address translation device comprising:*

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- a component for performing, at a packet level, a network address translation with respect to a stream of packets originating from a client in an internal network, wherein the client is communicating the stream of packets to a server located in an external network, and wherein the network address translation component redirects the stream of packets to a component for filtering;
  - the component for filtering, at a stream level, the stream of packets, wherein the filtering is transparent to the client;
  - a communication socket internal to the ***proxy network address translation*** device and communicatively connected to:
    - the component for performing the network address translation; and
    - the component for filtering; and
  - a component for transmitting the packets to the server after the packets are filtered.

13 As per Applicant's discussion with the Office, Applicant has amended this

14 claim to traverse the § 103 rejection over Antur in view of Rozell and further in

15 view of Xie. The amendments to claim 24 are consistent with the amendments

16 made to claim 22. Accordingly, for the same reasons as discussed above, and in

17 light of the current amendments, this claim is allowable.

18 **Claims 25 and 27-29** depend from claim 24 and thus are allowable as

19 depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their

20 own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 24, are

21 neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference of record.

22 **Claim 30** has been amended, and as amended recites a computer-

23 implemented method for communication between a first network and a second

24 network comprising [added language is indicated in bold italics]:

25

- intercepting, at a first external socket of a proxy network address translation device, a stream of packets;
- performing, at a first internal component of the proxy network address translation device, a network address translation upon the stream of packets, the network address translation occurring at a packet level;
- transmitting, from the first internal component of the proxy network address translation device to a second internal component of the proxy network address translation device *using a communication socket internal to the proxy network address translation device*, the translated stream of packets;
- filtering, at the second internal component of the proxy network address translation device, the translated stream of packets, the filtering occurring at a stream level; and
- transmitting, from the second external socket of the proxy network address translation device, the translated and filtered stream of packets.

As per Applicant's discussion with the Office, Applicant has amended this claim to traverse the § 103 rejection over Antur in view of Rozell and further in view of Xie. This claim already recites a *proxy network address translation* (PNAT) device and has been amended to recite a communication socket internal to the proxy network address translation device. As discussed above, none of the references of record teach or suggest a communication socket internal to the PNAT. Accordingly, for the same reasons as discussed above, and in light of the current amendments, this claim is allowable.

**Claim 31** depends from claim 30 and thus is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 30, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference of record.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**Conclusion**

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 3/7/2007

By: /Lance R. Sadler/  
Lance R. Sadler  
Reg. No. 38,605  
(509) 755-7251